United Nations S/PV.4437 (Resumption 1)

Security Council

Fifty-sixth year

Provisional

4437th meeting

Friday, 14 December 2001, 6 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Ouane	(Mali)
Members:	Bangladesh	Mr. Ahmad
	China	Mr. Chen Xu
	Colombia	Mr. Valdivieso
	France	Mr. Levitte
	Ireland	Mr. Corr
	Jamaica	Miss Durrant
	Mauritius	Mr. Koonjul
	Norway	Mr. Kolby
	Russian Federation	Mr. Granovsky
	Singapore	Mr. Mahbubani
	Tunisia	Mr. Tekaya
	Ukraine	Mr. Kuchinsky
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Cunningham

Agenda

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Letter dated 10 November 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/1072).

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

01-69907 (E)

The meeting was resumed at 7 p.m.

The President *(spoke in French)*: Before giving the floor to the next speaker, I would like to apologize to Member States for the delay in the meeting's resumption. The Security Council was engaged in such intense consultations that our discussion was prolonged. I reiterate our apologies to Member States.

The next speaker on my list is the representative of South Africa. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Kumalo (South Africa): My delegation is pleased to see you, Sir, presiding over the Security Council during this month. Under your able leadership we are confident that the Council will handle its matters with great honour and a sense of purpose.

Before I proceed with my speech, let me really thank the Security Council for making us proud today. As you know, Mr. President, it has always been a source of concern for us that when our ministers come to the Security Council they are always speaking very late in the debate, and their words no longer add to the debate on the issues under consideration. But today my delegation was very pleased that you were able to accommodate the Ministers early so that their words could really contribute to our work. We truly appreciate it.

The situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is of great concern to my Government. For many years, South Africa has been engaged in peaceful efforts to resolve the conflict in that country. My Government provided a neutral venue when the late President Mobutu Sese Seko negotiated the transition of government with the late President Laurent Kabila. We have continued to encourage the people of the Congo to resolve their differences through peaceful means. Next year, South Africa will host the inter-Congolese dialogue, and, as the Council knows, Mr. President, South African troops continue to serve with the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC).

South Africa is appearing before the Security Council with the aim of clarifying statements contained in the addendum to the report of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which was released on 13 November 2001. Our intention is to put the record straight so that we can build confidence and trust, not so much among ourselves but among the Congolese people, always with the aim of contributing to peace.

My delegation truly recognizes the scale of the task that confronted the Panel of Experts and the impact that it will have on the peace process. However, we feel compelled to express the South African Government's concern at the Panel's assertion that it received less than the fullest cooperation from South Africa. Such a claim is simply inconsistent with the facts.

As the Security Council knows, never has it been alleged, at any time, that the South African Government was in anyway implicated in wrongdoing in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. However, a number of allegations have been made against South African citizens or entities operating from our territory, and our own law enforcement agencies have investigated many such cases.

It was in this spirit that the Panel was on every occasion afforded both access to and complete cooperation from Government representatives, including law enforcement officials, most recently on 10 and 12 September 2001. In addition, the South African Government transmitted detailed reports in April and September 2001 in response to questions raised by the Panel. Additionally, my Government has continued to investigate and collect information on subjects raised by the Panel in its second questionnaire dated 20 September 2001. To further its own investigation, South Africa also requested additional information from the Panel in October 2001.

It is for this reason that my delegation is surprised at the claims by the Panel that there is "credible" information implicating individuals or entities of using South African territory and facilities to conduct illicit commercial activities involving the Congo's natural resources. This information was not mentioned, nor did the Panel offer to share this evidence, during its meetings with the South African authorities.

Already, South Africa has in place a comprehensive legislative framework that covers illicit activities of this nature. My country is not lacking in legislation, but in credible information and evidence. It stands to reason that my Government's ability to investigate and initiate legal proceedings against alleged offenders is dependent on obtaining

information. In this regard, we would appreciate receiving from the Panel of Experts the names of individuals and/or businesses, as well as supporting evidence of their alleged activities — dates, places, routes, time frames and associates in South Africa and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

My delegation would therefore humbly advise the Panel to be more willing to exchange detailed information with Member States. Any perceived unwillingness by the Panel of Experts in this regard constitutes a serious impediment to its own mandate. Until such time that the Panel provides South African law enforcement agencies with adequate information in substantiation of the allegations against individuals or entities, our own national capacity to thoroughly investigate, prosecute and monitor such activities will remain undermined, thus compromising the effectiveness of the work of the Panel of Experts. Meanwhile, we would hope that this perceived unwillingness by the Panel — and I pause here to say I am struck by the fact that all the ministers who spoke here referred to being "perceived to be unwilling" — to share relevant information is not and will not be construed as lack of cooperation.

My delegation is also concerned at the inconsistency in the references by the Panel of Experts to legal trade and illegal or illicit exploitation. In paragraph 15 (a) of its first report (A/2001/357), the Panel defined illegal activities as "all activities — extraction, production, commercialization and exports — taking place in the Democratic Republic of the Congo without the consent of the legitimate government". The current report, however, is inconsistent in this regard. It is the understanding of the South African Government that it was never the intention of the relevant Security Council resolutions to prohibit all trade with the Democratic Republic of the Congo. And many, many countries trade with the Democratic Republic of the Congo, including some that are represented around this table.

South Africa chairs the Kimberley process, which has developed detailed proposals for an international certification scheme for rough diamonds with a view to breaking the link between armed conflict and the trade in rough diamonds. It is indeed our hope that early in the new year the Kimberley process will report to the United Nations on how Member States are making sure that diamonds from conflict areas are not used to perpetuate wars such as the one we have witnessed in the Congo.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to assure you that the Government of South Africa will continue to provide its fullest cooperation to the Security Council and the Panel of Experts. No nation is more aware of how important the work of the Expert Panel is to the quest for durable peace and security in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank the representative of South Africa for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Canada. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Heinbecker (Canada) (*spoke in French*): Canada took note with great interest of the addendum to the report submitted to the Council by the Panel of Experts. It was very important that the Panel be able to complete its difficult work, and we thank them for it.

The addendum to the report takes nothing away from the severe comments and recommendations already expressed with respect to the actors operating with the cooperation or backing of forces exercising control of the so-called rebel zones. To the contrary, it presents a more complete and alarming picture of the extent of the illegal exploitation of natural resources throughout the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

This additional information put forward by the Panel of Experts has just increased the growing alarm of Canada concerning the illegal exploitation of natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This feeds even today a devastating conflict that has lasted for more than three years now.

Canada would like to reiterate its remarks of 3 May and, in particular, its condemnation of any persons, Governments and armed groups that have illegally exploited the resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and that have, through their activities, contributed to perpetuating the war in that country. Canada believes that the Security Council must ensure that measures are adopted to put an end to the plundering of the resources in the Congo.

If the Member States in question and other armed groups refuse to cooperate, the Council should apply stronger and more effective measures. Moreover, we believe that vigilance is required now more than ever, and that the Panel of Experts must be asked to pursue its work. Its mandate might be usefully adjusted and extended to make it possible to verify whether the plundering continues, to see if it develops in new directions and to better determine how the international community could contribute to putting an end to it without further burdening the population in their economic and security needs.

We are deeply convinced that any progress aimed at ending the illegal exploitation of natural resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo will be one more step towards a return to peace in this country and in the region.

The President (*spoke in French*): The next speaker is the representative of Belgium. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. De Ruyt (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — the associated countries of Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as Liechtenstein, the European Free Trade Association country belonging to the European Economic Area, align themselves with this statement.

The document before us, the addendum to the report of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, provides us with a detailed account of a grave and rather cheerless situation. It must nevertheless be read and, more to the point, studied, and we feel that it is essential to consider it with minute attention. We would like to warmly thank Ambassador Kassem and his team for the remarkable efforts they have made and the meticulousness with which, in a difficult context, they carried out this investigation.

The report shows that a conflict that was initially political and security-related in nature is becoming a struggle for riches. The parties involved have an interest in perpetuating the conflict, whose economic dimension, at the cost of war, is becoming a guiding force. Based as it is on a particularly cynical approach, this situation is above all tragic for the Congolese people, who, in the rationale being followed, see no peace and security on the horizon. The fate of the Congolese people is in part determined by this rush for lucre. They are the victims of their country's natural resources, whereas they should instead be the beneficiaries.

What is more, this situation is seriously complicating the efforts to restore peace. Specifically, the parties, with the help of the international community, are using political tools in a conflict which has to some extent become an economic struggle in which shifting alliances and the fragmentation of rebel movements seem to be dictated in part by the profit motive. Therein lies one of the key elements of a resolution of the conflict.

The European Union condemns this plundering of natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It must stop, and here the primary responsibility lies with the parties themselves. The international community, for its part, must take action, setting up control mechanisms and appropriate measures to halt smuggling. There have been praiseworthy initiatives, such as the Kimberley process on the role of diamonds in conflict, and we consider that this course should continue to be followed. We welcome the encouraging outcome of the meeting held in Gaborone, and eagerly await its follow-up by the General Assembly. But individual countries also have a contribution to make. Those cited in the report in particular must seriously study the information it contains and take the necessary measures. It is in that spirit that the States members of the European Union have taken due note of that information.

It is clear that finding appropriate ways to combat this exploitation is no simple matter. Today's meeting is one step in the process of consideration and analysis that must be pursued; the recommendations of the Panel of Experts can enhance that process. The mandate of the Panel should be renewed in order to maintain the very useful monitoring that its activities have thus far made possible. In that context, we feel that, in determining what follow-up it intends to give to the report, the Security Council should be guided by certain fundamental objectives. First, the follow-up must contribute to the dynamic of the Lusaka process, and must thus form part of the overall framework for seeking a political solution to the conflict in the

Democratic Republic of the Congo. Secondly, the fate of the Congolese people must be at the centre of all concerns.

We note that the Panel proposes a moratorium on certain resources. We believe that we must ensure that the few resources still genuinely in the hands of the Congolese people are not taken away from them, and that any restrictive measures should be carefully targeted against those responsible for the plundering. Here I would point out that the aim of the measures should be precisely to enable the Congolese people to benefit from the natural resources of their country.

The report also makes reference to a plan for rebuilding the Democratic Republic of the Congo. That is the objective of the European Union, which remains fully prepared to mobilize considerable resources, depending on the concrete progress made on various aspects of the peace process. The inter-Congolese dialogue is an important element of the peace process. We welcome the progress already made in that regard, and we encourage the parties to make every possible effort to make the planned meeting in South Africa a success.

In that connection, the European Union fully shares the concern of the Panel of Experts about the role that international aid could be playing in financing the continuation of the conflict. That issue requires a responsible approach by both bilateral and multilateral donors.

Finally, the European Union considers that the recommendation that all concession agreements and all commercial agreements and contracts be reviewed and revised to address and correct all irregularities is a measure that ought to be pursued.

The exploitation of natural and human resources is a key factor in the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It must be the object of very close and urgent attention by the international community, on the basis of a comprehensive strategy.

The President (*spoke in French*): The next speaker is the representative of Angola. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Mangueira (Angola): At the outset, Sir, on behalf of my Government, I would like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December. I would like also to congratulate the outgoing President for the dynamic way in which she steered the proceedings of the Council during her mandate. Further, I recognize the presence here of Their Excellencies the Foreign Ministers of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Uganda and Zimbabwe, the Adviser to the President of Rwanda, and the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania.

I take this opportunity to express our appreciation for the holding of this second open meeting on the activities of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the annex to whose report is contained in document S/2001/1072. In our view, that document makes reference to some matters that are of particular concern to the Angolan delegation, in spite of the fact that the Panel of Experts recognizes that the presence of Angola in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is based on strategic reasons and that Angola is the only country that did not receive significant compensation for its military action in that country, as was previously recognized by the same Panel in its report contained in document S/2001/357.

The reaffirmation of that fact, as we had the opportunity to state at the first public meeting of the Council on this topic, reflects a recognition of the policy of the Government of Angola, which is based, inter alia, on the principle of the defence of its sovereignty and of its national borders, on respect for the sovereignty of other States and on a policy of good-neighbourliness.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo is a sovereign and independent country recognized by the whole international community, and it has the capacity to sign agreements with other States in accordance with its national law and with international law. Therefore, the Government of Angola, as a matter of principle, cannot support some of the recommendations set out in the addendum to the report, particularly with regard to the question of the revision of concessions, trade agreements and other agreements signed between the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and other States, allied or not, because we consider that recommendation to constitute interference in the internal affairs of that country. That sovereign capacity is undisputed. Only the States concerned have the power to review those agreements, which they signed in accordance with public international law,

particularly the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969, and the power to make use of mechanisms for appropriate revision or amendment.

The Sonangol company, as part of its regional business strategy, has established partnerships with its counterparts in other countries aimed at contributing to the economic development of the countries concerned. Such partnerships include Sonangol-Cape Verde, Sonangol-Sao Tome and Principe, and Sonangol-Congo. These are mixed-capital companies established under agreements signed by the two Governments concerned in each case. I stress the importance of the partnership for the economy of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in keeping with the comments made by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in the document entitled "Note of the Government on the report of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo":

(*spoke in French*)

> "Under the economic convention signed by the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Angola, Sonangol imports and distributes petroleum products, thus ensuring a regular supply of its strategic products for the Congolese economy. Moreover, it builds service stations and creates jobs." (*S/2001/1156, annex (French only), para. 16*)

(*spoke in English*)

It is our conviction that the solution to the problems of the Democratic Republic of the Congo undoubtedly lies in the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement and the additional protocols, as well as in the pertinent Security Council resolutions, which, once thoroughly observed, will provide the necessary conditions for a definitive settlement of the issues related to the illegal exploitation of the natural resources and other forms of wealth of the Congo in which the international community has a relevant role to play.

To conclude, the recommendations of the Panel of Experts should formulate concrete measures designed to put an end to the illegal exploitation of said resources and should not liken those countries that have agreements voluntarily signed with the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to those which illegally exploit in any way the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo without the authorization of that Government.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank the representative of Angola for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Burundi. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Nteturuye (Burundi) (*spoke in French*): I should like first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council and to say how proud Burundi is of the dynamic spirit and the contribution of Mali to this prestigious body, which is entrusted with international peace and security.

Our admiration likewise goes to your predecessor, Miss Mignonette Patricia Durrant of Jamaica, for the outstanding manner in which she guided the work of the Council last month.

The Government of Burundi has read the additional report of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which supplements the first report of that same Panel. We wish to pay tribute to Ambassador Kassem and his team for their excellent work. The Government of Burundi will continue to give them the support and cooperation necessary to their mission.

Burundi wishes to make the following comments on the report under consideration.

First, the Government of Burundi welcomes the conclusions of the addendum to the report, which completely clears Burundi of any suspicion of involvement in the illegal exploitation of the resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Indeed, in paragraph 101 of the addendum, it is clearly stated that:

> "The Panel found no evidence directly linking the presence of Burundi in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to the exploitation of resources."

That same paragraph states that the presence of Burundi's army on the lake frontier with the Democratic Republic of the Congo

> "has been and continues to be directed at blocking attacks from the Burundi rebel groups, particularly FDD, which are based in South Kivu and Katanga."

The addendum thus confirms what the Government of Burundi has consistently asserted and what good-faith observers already knew.

During the meeting of the Security Council on the first report of the Group of Experts, the delegation of Burundi had questioned the existence of an International Monetary Fund (IMF) memorandum reporting that Burundi had been exporting minerals that it did not produce. The addendum, fortunately, has just confirmed our misgivings about this matter. In paragraph 102, the Panel of Experts states that it had "contacted the Africa Department of IMF, requesting a copy" of its memorandum, but that "the Panel has not been able to obtain a copy of it."

While the Government of Burundi is satisfied by the conclusions of the Panel of Experts concerning charges pertaining to the alleged involvement of Burundi in the illegal exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the delegation of Burundi is, however, concerned by information contained in certain paragraphs of the addendum regarding assistance granted to the armed groups Forces pour la défense de la démocratie (FDD) and Forces nationales pour la libération (FNL) in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

In paragraph 58 of the report, the Panel of Experts stated that it

> "received credible information, corroborating reports from independent sources, that Zimbabwe is supporting the Burundian FDD rebel forces by supplying them with weapons and expertise. Many reliable sources have informed the Panel this regard that the Zimbabwe Defence Forces are training FDD in Lubumbashi, where the FDD leadership is based and where Zimbabwean copper and cobalt investments are located. Another sign of their loosely structured coordination with the Burundian rebels is that the ALIR II forces are based near FDD in South Kivu and also have a command and liaison presence in Lubumbashi."

Paragraph 136 of the addendum states that

> "Zimbabwe and the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo supply arms to the FDD rebels ... The officers and non-commissioned officers are also trained by the Zimbabwean army ... in Lubumbashi. In exchange, FDD forces, acting essentially as mercenaries, fight alongside the Mayi-Mayi and ALIR forces".

Further, in paragraph 138, the report states that

> "The head of FDD, Jean-Bosco Ndayikengurukiye, is based in Lubumbashi. He is rumoured to control or own mining interests in the Katanga region, the profits from which he uses to cover some of his senior officers' expenses."

The Government of Burundi notes that this is not the first time that a report requested by the Security Council has reported destabilization of the security of Burundi, from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, by a regional coalition of negative forces. In the August 1998 report of the International Commission of Inquiry (Rwanda) established by resolution 1013 (1995), contained in document S/1998/777, the members of that Commission devoted an entire chapter to describing the links that exist between the former Rwandese forces and the Rwanda Interahamwe with the FDD and FNL of Burundi.

These inquiries were supported by important documents, contained in the report, indicating cooperation agreements signed between Rwandan and Burundian genocidal terrorists. The police of Burundi are also in possession of information concerning cooperation between the Allied Democratic Forces (ADF) rebels of Uganda of Jamilu Mukulu and the FDD-FNL Burundian terrorist movements.

The Government of Burundi calls on the Security Council to follow up on the conclusions of its own fact-finding missions, especially at this time, when the United Nations is being called upon to play an increasingly important role in the peace process in Burundi. The reports of these fact-finding missions should lead to consistent action.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the intransigence of the FDD and FNL armed terrorist groups is linked to the support that it has now been confirmed they are receiving from neighbouring countries. The time has therefore come for the Security Council and the international community to condemn these armed groups directly and hold them responsible for the terrorist acts they are committing against children, schoolchildren, students, women, the elderly, travellers, foreigners — and their property — and humanitarian personnel. The people of Burundi believe that the savagery of these killers is no different from that of, say, the Revolutionary United Front in Sierra Leone or UNITA in Angola — groups against which the Security Council has imposed sanctions that even extend to the countries and organizations that support them. The terrorist groups of Burundi are also acting as part of a coalition of negative regional forces that use the same methods of killing, are fuelled by the same ideology and pursue the same goals.

It would therefore be logical for the FDD and FNL to be placed on the same list of terrorist organizations that includes the ALIR of Rwanda and the ADF and the Lord's Resistance Army of Uganda — a list that has already been made public by the Governments of two permanent members of the Security Council — the United States of America and the United Kingdom.

The Government of Burundi requests the Security Council, the region, the facilitators and the entire international community to focus all their efforts on what is now the highest priority in Burundi: bringing about a complete and permanent ceasefire. That can become a reality only if coercive and firm measures are taken against the FDD and FNL armed groups, which have stepped up their violent actions against the innocent population since the establishment of the transitional Government, and which no longer have any political justification for turning a deaf ear to appeals for negotiation and ceasefire. Similar pressures should also be exerted on countries that provide recruitment and training, or serve as transit or assembly areas, for the FDD or FNL. The Government has made specific proposals for cooperation and consultation to those countries, and will continue to do so.

Finally, the Government of Burundi reiterates its willingness to negotiate a ceasefire with the FDD and FNL forces and to pursue dialogue with all neighbouring countries, especially the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Tanzania, with a view to seeking together the fastest way to bring peace back to Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the whole of the Great Lakes region.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank the representative of Burundi for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Nigeria. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Hart (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation is particularly delighted to see our sister country, Mali, and you, Sir, our friend, Ambassador Moctar Ouane, in the chair as President of the Security Council for the month of December. We have implicit confidence in your competence and ability to successfully guide the work of the Council.

In the same vein, we would like to commend Ambassador Patricia Durrant of Jamaica for the effective manner in which she conducted the affairs of the Council last month.

Today's debate on the report (S/2001/1072) of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo is greatly welcomed by our delegation. This debate provides us with an opportunity to share our views on the illicit exploitation of the mineral resources that legitimately belong to the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the consequent prolongation of the ethnic conflicts in the Great Lakes region.

We note with interest the remark contained in paragraph 10 of the report that the history of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, regardless of the political system or governing authority in place, has been one of systematic abuse of its natural and human resources, such that a country noted for its vast natural resources was reduced to being one of the poorest and debt-ridden by the early 1990s. This is indeed unfortunate. It is also true that most countries in Africa endowed with such natural resources as gold, diamonds and oil have also suffered a similar fate of the illegal exploitation of their mineral wealth, to the disadvantage of those countries and their peoples.

In some countries, like Sierra Leone, Angola and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, available natural resources which would have served as catalysts

for economic growth and development, are used as rewards for warlords who wage wars to gain control of those resources. These warlords have made enormous profits through the indiscriminate granting of concessions to their cronies to satisfy pressing political needs and exigencies. Consequently, these countries have become increasingly impoverished as a result of persistent corruption, patronage and lack of accountability.

In paragraph 56, the report of the Panel establishes a link between the exploitation of resources and the continuation of the conflicts in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The emergence of various splinter rebel groups, such as the Uganda People's Defence Forces, the Mouvement de libération congolais and the Mayi-Mayi, has been linked to the struggle for the control of such resources as coltan, gold and diamonds in the Beni and Bafwasende areas, as well as in other areas of the Congo.

However, what is more worrying is the fact that, according to the report, some neighbouring countries have been supporting these rebel groups, mainly because of the attraction of winning concessions to exploit those mineral resources.

My delegation is concerned about the revelations in section V of the report, which discusses recent developments and their implications, particularly those relating to the stated roles of Zimbabwe and Rwanda in the Congo and their possible effects on the security concerns of Rwanda and Burundi, as well as on the prolongation of the war. We want to state that such developments — if confirmed — would not be in the interests of our collective desire for peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The problems in the Democratic Republic of the Congo are multifaceted and cannot be dealt with in isolation. The solution should take into account the larger problems of general peace and security in the entire Great Lakes region. We therefore believe that concerted efforts should also be made to reassure neighbouring countries like Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi of their own security. It is only through such collective action that the smuggling of mineral resources along the porous borders could be checked. In this regard, Nigeria supports the recommendation contained in the report, which stresses the need for the countries in the Great Lakes region to put in place effective controls and legal mechanisms to address the smuggling of resources.

My delegation also believes that the Bretton Woods institutions and international donors should play effective roles in helping to rebuild the economy of the region by injecting investable funds for infrastructure and general development. Accordingly, Nigeria supports the Panel's call for international donors to consider submitting to the Security Council, within the shortest possible time, a comprehensive programme for financing development in the region.

Nigeria favours the recommendation that a moratorium be declared for a specific period of time on the purchase and importation of precious products, such as coltan, diamonds, gold, copper, cobalt, timber and coffee, originating from areas where foreign troops are presently located in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This would be in addition to the standardization of the certificates of origin for mineral resources from these areas, to be monitored by the World Diamond Council, the United Nations Forum on Forests and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

Finally, my delegation urges the Security Council to consider the imposition of sanctions on any country that violates the resolution on the exploitation of mineral resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. As the brotherly people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo anxiously look to the Security Council for assistance, we urge the Council to give urgent consideration to this matter with a view to finding lasting solutions to the vexed issue of illicit exploitation of the God-given wealth of these countries.

The President *(spoke in French):* I thank the representative of Nigeria for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Zambia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Musambachime (Zambia): My delegation would like to congratulate you, my brother from the great Republic of Mali, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December.

Allow me also to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Durrant of Jamaica, who guided the deliberations of the Council in the month of November.

In addition, allow me to welcome the presence and the statements of the Ministers from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania, and the Adviser to the President of the Republic of Rwanda. Their participation in the deliberations this afternoon have helped to clarify a number of issues.

I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for convening this very important meeting on the illegal exploitation of the natural resources and other forms of wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, our neighbour. The convening of this meeting is yet another demonstration of the Security Council's continued resolve to ensure the full implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement in order to achieve durable peace and stability in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in our region as a whole. It is for this reason that the Republic of Zambia provided its full assistance to the Panel to facilitate its work during its visit to our country.

I also want to assure you, Mr. President, that the Government of the Republic of Zambia will continue to cooperate fully with you and the other members of the Security Council in your noble efforts.

It is no secret that the Zambian Government attaches great importance to all efforts to ensure that there is peace and stability in our region. My Government has always played a leading role in these efforts in Angola and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Our contributions have been acknowledged by the Council and the international community at large. The efforts and personal sacrifices of the President of the Republic of Zambia, Mr. Frederick J. T. Chiluba, in the pursuit of peace and stability in the Congo are well known and well documented, and cannot be ignored. He has done everything possible to advance the cause of peace.

My delegation is therefore extremely disappointed with the comments about my country contained in the addendum to the report of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, contained in document S/2001/1072. Without even acknowledging the enormous sacrifices that Zambia has made and continues to make in the search for peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Panel makes serious and unsubstantiated allegations against my country. In the report, the Panel is in fact insinuating that Zambia is undermining its own efforts and those of the international community to bring peace to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Please allow me to address some of the issues raised by the Panel. In paragraph 111, the Panel alleges that

> "Zambia does not have the capacity to exert much control over the refugee camps in its territory, where training activities have been conducted for incursions carried out from Zambian territory."

This is a serious allegation. It casts serious doubts on the sovereignty of our country as well as on the ability of our security institutions to conduct or undertake their statutory functions. We do not know how the Panel arrived at this conclusion, because — let me tell the Council — during all the times it was in Zambia, it did not visit a single refugee camp. Therefore, we wonder why the Panel, without knowing the facts, chose to cast Zambia's ability in a negative light. This is unacceptable.

According to the 1951 United Nations Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, to which Zambia adheres religiously, the supervision, administration and management of refugee camps are the responsibility of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The host country provides security for refugees and citizens alike.

UNHCR has been in Zambia for more than 30 years. In that period, it has never complained of Zambia's lack of capacity to provide military or police protection. Similarly, UNHCR has never complained that refugees' enjoyment of rights was worse than that of the citizens, residents, migrant workers, tourists and visitors. This statement, therefore, is far from the truth.

Zambia currently hosts more than 270,000 refugees, who are in two settlements and four camps under the supervision of UNHCR. If it is true that military training is being conducted in these camps, as the Panel alleges, then the conclusion would be that this is being done with the full knowledge of UNHCR. Of course, we know that this is not true.

The protracted conflicts in Angola and the Democratic Republic of the Congo have continued to generate large numbers of refugees who are sheltered in Zambia. As pointed out in the UNHCR report in document A/56/12, Zambia is the country most adversely affected by the influx of refugees from those two countries. Because of our adherence to the United Nations Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, my country continues to shoulder the heavy burden of looking after refugees. Unfortunately, we must admit that the arrival of civilian refugees is often accompanied by the entry into the country of armed elements and ex-combatants. This situation poses a very serious threat to the security of the local population and of the civilian refugees themselves.

To counter this, the Zambian Government, in collaboration with UNHCR, disarms and separates those identified as ex-combatants and sends them to a refugee camp called Ukwimi, which is located in the eastern part of the country, close to the Malawian border and far from the borders of Angola and the Democratic Republic of the Congo and from the camps for civilian refugees. Currently, I wish to report that Ukwimi refugee camp is holding 2,278 ex-combatants, who are being screened by the National Eligibility Committee in collaboration with UNHCR.

I want to inform the Council that this information was and is readily available not only with the Zambian Government, but with UNHCR as well. The Panel could easily have got this information had it asked for it. One wonders why, when there are facts, the Panel decided to insinuate otherwise and to paint a completely erroneous picture.

Annex I of the addendum to the Panel's report is a list of the countries it visited and the officers it met. On page 35, it is clearly indicated that the Panel met with the President of the Republic of Zambia, Mr. Chiluba; four Government Ministers, including the Ministers of Defence and Presidential Affairs; and the Permanent Secretaries of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and of Mines and Minerals Development. As a nation, we are therefore shocked to note that, in paragraph 114, the Panel reports that there was a lack of cooperation from the Government of the Republic of Zambia.

I want to pose the following questions. Where was the lack of cooperation when the Panel met the topmost person in the country — the President — and the Ministers relevant to its visit? Where was the lack of cooperation when the Government of the Republic of Zambia ensured that the Panel met with whomever it requested to meet? Where was the lack of cooperation when the Government of the Republic of Zambia ensured that it visited places that it wanted to visit? Indeed, where was the lack of cooperation when the Government provided transport and other facilities for the Panel?

Sharing the longest border with the Democratic Republic of the Congo, my country has been the worst affected by the spillover from the conflict. Zambia does not stand to gain in any way from this conflict. In fact, the conflict is impacting negatively on the well-being of Zambians. The continuous flow of refugees and increased insecurity along the borders have greatly disrupted the lives of our people. We do not cherish this situation and that is what the Panel should have known and should know.

Zambia has always supported and cooperated with the panels sent by the Security Council and other United Nations bodies. We have facilitated their smooth operation in the country and ensured that all impediments to their work were removed. They have been free to go wherever they want and to see whomever and whatever they want to see.

My delegation is convinced that the mandate given to this Panel was a noble one and made in good faith. We believe that, if properly focused, the Panel could make a positive contribution towards bringing peace and stability to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. However, the tone and content of the report as it relates to Zambia creates an element of distrust and suspicion which could easily fuel an already volatile situation. We have already invested a lot in the search for peace. We should not allow the efforts that we have made and the progress so painstakingly achieved to be undermined by people with different intentions and agendas.

We are therefore disturbed by these unjustifiable accusations. If the Panel, as claimed in paragraph 111, has information that various Congolese resources transit through Zambia illegally, the noble and decent thing to do would be to inform my Government so that the necessary control measures can be effected.

My country therefore challenges the Panel to substantiate these allegations as they appear in the report. If it should fail to do so, we would demand a

retraction and an apology. We make these demands because we believe in transparency; we believe in objectivity, justice and fair play. I wish to assure the Council that we will always extend help to other panels.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank the representative of Zambia for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Namibia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Theron (Namibia): It gives my delegation great pleasure to see you, Sir, presiding over the work of the Council. I wish to thank you for scheduling this very important meeting. I also wish to congratulate Ambassador Durrant of Jamaica for the excellent manner in which she conducted the work of the Council in November, and in particular for the focus on African situations.

I would also like to acknowledge the presence of all the ministers at this meeting.

My delegation wishes to reiterate its thanks and appreciation to Ms. Ba-N'Daw for presenting us with the report in April on the disturbing facts about the illegal exploitation of natural resources and other forms of wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and with the recommendations. We also welcome the addendum containing additional information prepared by Ambassador Kassem and his team. Namibia has submitted a formal response to the addendum to the Security Council.

Namibia's support for the establishment and mandate of the Panel was and remains intended to help put an end to the plundering of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which are being used to fuel the conflict. Our support stems from a deep desire to preserve the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It is for these reasons that on both occasions when the Panel visited Namibia, the Government of the Republic of Namibia rendered all necessary assistance and extended full cooperation in facilitating its meetings with all relevant Government authorities, as requested. In this context, we welcome the expression of gratitude from the Panel for the excellent cooperation, as stated in annex I of the addendum. Namibia welcomes the proposed extension of the Panel's mandate and pledges its continued cooperation.

The naked aggression against the Democratic Republic of the Congo by Uganda and Rwanda and the accompanying suffering and hardship caused to the people of that country were exacerbated by a process of systematic looting and pillaging of the natural resources and other forms of wealth of their country by the very same forces responsible for the invasion. The tragic effects of these crimes have been well illustrated in the Panel report, as well as in other reports on the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Unfortunately, the situation continues with impunity today and is clearly directly linked to the continued occupation of the country. Those countries that have violated the sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo have persisted in their defiance of Security Council resolutions, in particular resolutions 1304 (2000) and 1376 (2001).

It is worthwhile recalling the well-illustrated statistics in the main report, showing the discrepancies between the production of minerals and other resources by these countries and their exports. Even more specifically, the Panel, in paragraph 125 of the same report, concluded that the economies of Rwanda and Uganda have benefited financially from the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

In contrast to the illegal exploitation by countries that have violated the sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Panel has correctly indicated that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has, as any sovereign State has the right to do, in some instances relied on income from the resources of the country to assist in its defence against its aggressors. In the addendum, the Panel acknowledged that most transactions by those countries that came to the defence of the Democratic Republic of the Congo were done in line with normal economic cooperation between sovereign States. They were carried out through the establishment of joint ventures and other well-established trade practices.

My delegation welcomes the recommendations in the report aimed at putting an end to the illegal exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. However, it cannot support recommendations in the addendum that attempt to question or discredit sovereign decisions taken by the legitimate Government of the Democratic Republic of

the Congo. Therefore, for my delegation, the recommendation that the Security Council create a body to review concessions, commercial agreements and contracts concluded by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo is unacceptable.

I now wish to make a few specific comments about the utility of the Panel reports and to register some misgivings of my delegation.

While we welcome the findings of the Panel, in our view, in some instances it appeared reluctant to state that a specific country was not illegally exploiting the resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, even where overwhelming evidence to that effect was submitted. Just as the Panel proved conclusively through the publishing of statistics provided by countries themselves, as well as by international financial institutions, that Rwanda and Uganda are engaged in the illegal exploitation of the resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the same kind of information and procedures could have been used to prove that other countries are not benefiting from the illegal exploitation of the natural resources and other forms of wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Furthermore, whereas in the addendum the Panel has extensively reported on transactions concerning the exploitation of the resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in contrast to its mandate of investigating the illegal exploitation of the natural resources and other forms of the country's wealth, the addendum appears to have focused only on countries in Africa. It would have been enlightening to have a wider perception of the commercial transactions for the exploitation of the resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo involving actors outside Africa.

Finally, the reference in the addendum to the personal decision by His Excellency President Nujoma is wrong. While this has no relevance to the Panel's mandate, I wish to point out that decisions of the Government of the Republic of Namibia are taken in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Constitution of the Republic of Namibia and that those were fully respected when this decision was made.

Let me repeat once again what we have said in this Chamber — that Namibia's involvement in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was at the expressed invitation of the legitimate Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and not for the exploitation of Congolese coltan, gold, copper, cobalt, diamonds, timber or any other resources.

Namibia has repeatedly stressed the need for respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and for its control over its natural resources. The illegal exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, if not put to an end, will defeat the efforts of the Security Council in that country. The report of the Panel of Experts clearly identified the link between the invasion of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the plundering of its resources and the continuation of the conflict. This is at the core of the Panel's mandate, and the Security Council should not loose sight of this important link.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to impress on the Security Council the need to ensure that the countries that have invaded the Democratic Republic of the Congo withdraw without delay, even if that means adopting further measures in terms of its mandate under the Charter. Any further measures decided on by the Council should include the payment of reparations and compensation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo by the invading countries. The Council cannot afford its decisions being ignored continuously, since, in allowing this, it risks serious damage to its credibility.

The Panel of Experts had an important mandate. The besieged Congolese people are counting on the Security Council to help put an end to the plundering of their resources and to assist in making peace in their country a reality.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank the representative of Namibia for the kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Japan. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Yamamoto (Japan): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for giving my delegation the opportunity to participate in today's discussion on this important issue. I would also like to thank the Panel of Experts for producing a well-balanced addendum to the report on the illegal exploitation of natural resources and other forms of wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The illicit exploitation of natural resources, not only in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, but also in other parts of the world, is a cause of recurring open hostilities and a major obstacle to the settlement of conflicts. As Japan stressed in its statement before this body last May, it must be stopped.

Towards this end, Japan has been participating in the discussions of the Kimberley process, which addresses the problem of conflict diamonds. Through this process, the international community has learned valuable lessons regarding the curtailment of illicit exploitation of natural resources for conflict prevention, while at the same time protecting the legitimate exploitation of natural resources for the promotion of development.

With respect specifically to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Japan hopes that the following two points will be taken well into account when the Security Council considers the recommendations contained in the addendum report.

First, producing countries and importing countries must acknowledge their responsibility and commit themselves to breaking the circle of conflict and the illicit exploitation of natural resources. This consciousness of responsibility will provide an environment in which the international community will be encouraged to take voluntary initiatives to stop the illicit trade.

Secondly, with the end of the conflict in sight, the process of demobilization, disarmament and reintegration and efforts for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo have begun. In support of those efforts, it is crucial that legitimate trade in primary commodities be protected. As the addendum to the report points out, those items which are illicitly exploited and traded in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo are not confined to coltan and diamonds, but also include gold, copper, cobalt and timber. But because these primary commodities are important sources of income for the nation-building efforts of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, if the international community agrees that illicit trade in these items needs to be regulated, it should be done in such a way as not to be detrimental to revitalizing economic activities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In this connection, the international community should pay due attention to protecting the legitimate exploitation and trade in primary commodities in the country.

As we emphasized in our statement last May, the relationship between the illicit exploitation of natural resources and the protraction of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo must be considered in the wider context of consolidating peace throughout the region. This will require a comprehensive and integrated approach. I would thus like to underline the importance of convening an international conference on peace and development in the Great Lakes region, as recommended in the addendum to the report, as well as the acceleration of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process by the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This will help create a conducive environment in which the countries concerned can discuss ways of securing their borders.

Finally, the ministerial meeting in preparation for the Third Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD III) was held in Tokyo on 3 and 4 December. The chair's statement issued at that meeting welcomed the adoption of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) as a manifestation of the commitment of African leaders to effective leadership and accountability. NEPAD reflects the principles of global partnership and ownership. I would like to emphasize the importance of these principles in the context of addressing the illicit exploitation of natural resources and the ongoing conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the Chairman of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mr. Mahmoud Kassem, to respond to the comments made and the questions raised.

Mr. Kassem: Because of the lateness of the hour, I will confine myself to replying to two of this morning's interventions and one from this late meeting.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zimbabwe said that Zimbabwe's presence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is an enactment of the mutual defence agreement of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and came about following a direct plea from the sovereign Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Zimbabwe's initial military involvement in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was under the pretext of the SADC mutual defence arrangements. However, it is the nature of this presence today which is of interest to the Panel. Is the Zimbabwean military presence today an enactment of this mutual defence arrangement, or has it evolved into something else as the conflict level subsides? If Zimbabwe's presence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is a burden on its limited resources, why does it continue? Why have there have been no troop reductions to reflect the level of the conflict?

The Minister went on to state that Zimbabwe's activities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo are legitimate, bilateral, commercial relations between two sovereign countries. Zimbabwe makes no secret of the fact that it finances its presence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo through its joint ventures with the Congolese Government. Zimbabwe's commercial activities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo are based on arrangements made with the Congolese Government in Kinshasa. That is an undeniable fact. Is it legal? That is another matter.

In order to better understand this, we have to ask ourselves the following questions. Were the conditions under which this commercial activity was established normal? Are these activities considered legal by the often sidelined Congolese law? Does the nature of these commercial activities reflect commonly accepted bilateral commercial ties? In fair market terms, does the value of Zimbabwean gains from commercial activities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo reflect the size of its modest investments? The answer to these questions is no.

Regarding the conditions of the agreements made, the Panel would just like to recall the signing of the contracts transferring the Kababencola Mining Company (KMC) to the Zimbabwean businessman John Bredenkamp. This took place at the Grand Hotel in Kinshasa, where all the senior management officials of Gécamines were present, as well as senior Zimbabwean military officers. The Zimbabwean side, which had prepared the contract, allowed no one to leave before the contract was signed, unchanged. As to whether Congolese law was respected with regard to the Zimbabwean concession, the Panel only wishes to refer to the Sengamines deal. The legality of the Congolese Government directly negotiating and granting concessions on behalf of the Société minière de Bakwanga (MIBA) should be seriously considered — assuming that the Congolese Government has that right, as a partner in MIBA. However, the Congolese Government did not consult Sibeka, the other partner in MIBA, when it decided to grant Sengamines the best concession lands. Irrespective of its legality, how can this be considered as commonly accepted commercial behaviour?

Regarding the value of the investments, the addendum clearly outlines that the Zimbabwean role offered neither capital nor land nor entrepreneurship. This, then, leads us to the two most important and relevant questions: first, would Zimbabwe's commercial activities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo be negatively affected if it had no military presence in the country? Secondly, are Zimbabwe's policies and actions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo aimed at prolonging the conflict so as to ensure that this military presence continues in order to safeguard its commercial activities? The answer to both questions is yes.

One needs only to look at the areas where Zimbabwean troops are deployed to realize how strategically located they are with regard to their concessions. Zimbabwe's aid to the Forces pour la défense de la démocratie (FDD), which is documented in the addendum, also gives a clear example of how this country is actively taking steps to prolong the conflict.

Finally, if the Government of Zimbabwe still holds the same position regarding the legality of these contracts and concessions, then it should be the first to welcome a review of its commercial activities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. A revision of these contracts, under the auspices of a third party and in an atmosphere of transparency, would reconfirm their nature. This would enable both Zimbabwe and the Democratic Republic of the Congo to then engage in sound, unquestionable and sustainable commercial relations under fair market terms. This is a development that would unarguably be to the benefit of both the Congolese and Zimbabwean people.

Turning to an intervention made by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, who alleged that his Government has been cooperative with the Panel, I would state that the Panel in fact did not understand why the Tanzanian Government showed so much hostility — I repeat, so much hostility — to the

Panel, irrespective of the fact that the Tanzanian Government appointed low- to medium-level officials to meet with the Panel. These officials were actively — I repeat, actively — discouraged from disclosing information to the Panel. As for his allegation that the Panel has twice accused the Bank of Tanzania of being involved in illicit smuggling of diamonds originating in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Panel had taken note of the Tanzanian Government's position, especially the point of view conveyed by the Governor of the Bank of Tanzania, with whom it met. Accordingly, further investigations were carried out which have once again revealed that the initial information presented remains valid. In the case of the Bank of Tanzania, evidence acquired by the Panel has shown that certain individuals working at the Bank have actively been marketing diamonds originating in the Democratic Republic of the Congo — from the premises of the Bank. It has knowledge of at least three deals concluded there which were destined for Antwerp, Amsterdam and Johannesburg. As regards the United Republic of Tanzania, at this point I will stop.

I did not really intend to respond to the representative of Zambia. But I was really surprised when he put to me these questions with regard to cooperation or lack thereof. In the end he posed a very surprising question: where was the lack of cooperation when my Government provided transport to the Panel? As far as I know, it is the United Nations that supplies all the needs of the Panel — and nobody else, including Zambia.

As for the lack of cooperation, I would just like to say a few words. At its meeting in Lusaka, the Panel was surprised that even what could be considered public information, in the papers, was not given freely to the Panel. Officials who attended the meetings were either evasive or simply uncooperative. In some instances, junior officials clearly indicated that they were not authorized to disclose any information to the Panel. It should also be noted that, although a meeting with President Chiluba had been scheduled, the Panel learned upon arrival in Lusaka that the meeting had been unilaterally cancelled. It was only after the Panel's complaint to Minister of State Eric Silwamba about Zambia's lack of cooperation — and he was surprised — that a meeting with President Chiluba was hastily arranged at the last minute before we left. Furthermore, additional information requested in writing from the Zambian Government was received after the completion of the addendum.

The President *(spoke in French)*: I thank Mr. Kassem for the further information and responses he has provided.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 8.40 p.m.